DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 831 24 PS 004 807

AUTHOR Geiger, Edwin L.; Epps, Edgar G.
TITLE Effects of Social Class Integration of Preschool Negro Children on Test Performance and Self-Concept. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Tuskegee Inst., Ala.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-D-072
PUB DATE Jun 70
GRANT OEG-4-9-080072-0002-010
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Lower Class, Middle Class, *Negro Youth, Peer Groups, *Preschool Children, *School Integration, Self Concept, *Social Class, *Social Integration, Test Results

ABSTRACT

This study, designed to assess the effects of social class integration, tested the following hypothesis: Preschool age black children from middle class socioeconomic (SES) backgrounds will not be adversely affected by attending a daily program with a smaller group of black peers from lower SES backgrounds. A pre- and posttest battery administered to all the subjects included the Standford-Binet Intelligence Test, the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA), the Caldwell Preschool Inventory, and the Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test. The subjects were black children, 46- to 57-months old at the beginning of the study, divided into three classroom groups: an experimental group of 10 middle class and five lower class children, a middle class control group (N=15), and a lower class control group (N=15). Results for the Binet, ITPA, and Self-Concept Test support the hypothesis; results for the Caldwell Preschool Inventory do not. Because of the small size of the groups studied and the presence of confounding factors in the design, the results are viewed as tentative. (Author/AJ)

ED050831

BR-8-D-072
PA-24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project Number 8-D-072
Grant Number OEG-4-9-080072-0002-010

EFFECTS OF SOCIAL CLASS INTEGRATION OF PRESCHOOL NEGRO CHILDREN ON TEST PERFORMANCE AND SELF-CONCEPT

Edwin L. Geiger, Principal Investigator
Ithaca College
Ithaca, New York

Edgar G. Epps, Project Director
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

June, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant (grant or contract) with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

PS 004607

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project could not have been undertaken without the cooperation and assistance of the directors of the nursery school and day care centers. We, therefore, wish to thank Mrs. Sereeta H. Reed, Director of Russell Nursery School, and Mrs. Irene Wilson, Director of the Macon County Day Care Services Program, for their valuable assistance. The contributions of the nursery school teachers, and the day care teachers are also gratefully acknowledged.

Members of the Division of Behavioral Science Research staff who made valuable contributions, include Mrs. Annie F. Ricks, Mrs. Celia H. Jefferson, and Dr. Glenn R. Howze.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
SUMMARY	v
INTRODUCTION	1
HYPOTHESIS	2
METHOD	3
RESULTS	5
DISCUSSION	8
REFERENCES	12
APPENDIX	13

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	SELECTED SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS	4
2	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR MEASURES AND SUBSCALES	6
3	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (2X2) FOR MEASURES AND SUBSCALES	7
4	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR MIDDLE CLASS Ss (E m c vs. Cl.) FOR MEASURES AND SUBSCALES	9

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to assess the effects of placing disadvantaged black subjects (Ss) together with black Ss from middle socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds into a shared preschool program. We refer to this procedure as "social-class integration." It was the only educational variable employed; no other form of preschool enrichment was introduced.

The rationale for undertaking this study was our assumption that imitation is the learning mechanism which best accounts for changes in performance levels facilitated by an integrated environment. Ss exhibiting desirable behavior patterns are presumed to become models for others to emulate. Models may introduce new patterns of behavior or simply demonstrate behaviors previously introduced. The most potent model for children appears to be a group of high status playmates who initiate increasingly complex patterns of reciprocal interaction. Thus, our middle class black Ss are viewed as appropriate models for our lower class Black Ss.

We, therefore, placed preschool age Black children from lower SES backgrounds in a cooperative program with preschool age Black children from middle SES backgrounds. The former group was selected from a Day Care Service Program operated by the local Community Action Agency; the latter group was chosen from a college operated nursery school. An experimental group was formed which included five Day Care children and ten nursery school children. The group met at the nursery school and participated in the regular nursery school program. Another nursery school class and a Day Care Center class, each consisting of 15 children, served as control groups.

A test battery was administered to all subjects at the start and at the conclusion of the project. The battery included the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, the Caldwell-Preschool Inventory, and the Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test.

The following hypothesis was tested: Preschool age Black children from middle SES backgrounds will not be adversely affected by attending a daily program with a smaller group of Black peers from lower SES backgrounds. Results for three of the four measures (Binet, ITPA and Self-Concept Test) support the hypothesis; results for one measure (Caldwell Preschool Inventory) do not support the hypothesis. This latter result is confounded by an age difference (Middle Class E group mean age was four months younger than that of Middle Class C group). Because of the small size of the groups studied and the presence of confounding factors in the design, the results are viewed as tentative. Additional research on this question is recommended.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to assess the effects of placing disadvantaged black* subjects (Ss) together with black Ss from middle socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds into a shared preschool program. We refer to this procedure as "social-class integration." It was the only educational variable employed; no other form of preschool enrichment was introduced.

The Equality of Educational Opportunity survey (Coleman, 1966), designed to evaluate the effects of racial integration, found SES to be the prime correlate of academic achievement. When racial integration proved beneficial to blacks it was in instances where blacks were predominantly lower class and whites predominantly middle class. This occurred when the former were in the minority with no effects noted for the middle-class white majority. It would appear, therefore, that integration of educational facilities should be concerned with social class rather than race. Moynihan (1967) is in agreement with this notion when he writes that:

> .....equality of educational achievement in the American school system depends at least as much on who you go to school with as what kind of school you go to. This is a matter we can always think of in terms of race, but it seems to me that it is important that we should begin to see that the underlying reality is not race but social class. (p. 7).

Relatively little is known concerning the comparative characteristics of SES distinctions within the black community. Bloom, Whiteman & Deutsch (1965) noted that some characteristics are shared by blacks within the same socioeconomic level while other factors are associated with either race or class but not with both. Working with four-year-old black children and their mothers, Hess and Shipman (1968) found numerous SES distinctions for language output and usage. In this study, we have been concerned with SES distinctions among black children which appear to relate to future academic success.

Imitation is the learning mechanism which best accounts for changes in performance levels facilitated by an integrated environment. Ss exhibiting desirable behavior patterns are presumed to become models for others to emulate.

---

*We shall employ the parallel constructions "black" and "white" in preference to other, more evasive, but no more scientifically grounded, terms to refer to the racial dichotomy perceived in our society.

Models may introduce new patterns of behavior or simply frequently demonstrate behaviors previously introduced. The most potent model for children appears to be a group of playmates, perceived as having high status, who initiate increasingly complex patterns of reciprocal interaction (Bronfenbrenner, 1969). All of these characteristics would appear to be found in our middle-class black Ss in relation to our lower class black Ss.

Another issue concerns the effect that group interaction with disadvantaged children has on middle class youths. Although Coleman's findings suggest that direction of influence flows from majority members of a classroom to minority members, the entire pattern has never been fully explored. The fear of possible "contagion" from lower class children was very evident in the parents of our middle-class Ss and necessitated an alteration of our original design.

Our initial plan was to set up two experimental (E) groups, one located in the Tuskegee Institute nursery school and the other at an Office of Economic Opportunity day care center. Differences between these groups would have reflected environmental and program discrepancies for the two settings. We found that virtually none of the middle class (and frequently upwardly mobile) black parents in the community were willing to permit their children to attend a program at a center created for disadvantaged children. A substitute measure would have been to establish a lower class control group within the nursery school. This was prohibited due to the lack of space at the nursery school to accommodate such a group along with all of the applicants from the campus community.

Consequently, our results with regard to our lower class Ss are considered to be exploratory due to the lack of an adequate lower class control group and to the minimal size of our sample. We are focusing on the effects on middle class black children in a social class integrated preschool setting. In light of our experiences with the Tuskegee Institute community, we consider this to be a crucial educational issue.

HYPOTHESIS

Preschool age black children from middle SES backgrounds will not be adversely affected by attending a daily program with a smaller group of black peers from lower SES backgrounds.

METHOD

The Ss were all black children ranging in age from 46 months to 57 months at the study's initiation. They were divided into three classroom groups: an experimental (E) group consisting of ten middle class and five lower class Ss; a middle class control group (C1), N=15 and a lower class control group (C2), N=15.

Lower class Ss were randomly selected from the lists of three local day care centers. Middle class Ss were selected from the nursery school registration list. Older children tended to be placed in the control group due to the nursery school staff's desire not to have children feel they were being "left back." Consequently, our middle class Es had a mean age of four months less than our C1 group and five months less than our lower class Es. (See Table 1). No other selection criterion was employed.

All lower class Ss came from homes falling within the OEO's official designation of "poverty." The mean annual family income was $2,327. The Ss as a group had noticeable differences from the middle class sample in speech and in dress. There were no noticeable distinctions in activity level or health factors. The mean annual family income for middle class Ss was $9,530.

The E and C1 groups attended Russell Nursery School, a large, modern structure with observation booths; C2 met in a center located in the basement of a nearby church. The curricula at both programs adhered to traditional concepts of nursery education. Classes at the nursery school were from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; the day care center operated from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Both included a rest period of 1-1/2 - 2 hours.

Teachers for the three classroom groups were all females and possessed comparable educational backgrounds (B.S. plus further study). The teachers for the E and C2 groups were black, for C1 white. The principal investigator noted no salient distinctions in quality of speech, temperament or philosophy of education after 10 months of substantial contact with, and observation of, all three teachers. Classrooms at the nursery school contained two student aides at all times. At the day care center, aides were volunteers from the community and had varying backgrounds. Aides for all of the groups were black females.

While the materials and equipment at the nursery school and day care center were similar, those at the nursery school tended to be newer. All classroom factors (room size, materials, etc.) were identical for the E and C1 groups as was the daily curriculum. (see appendix).

The test battery consisted of the following:

1. The Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (form L-M)

2. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities

3. The Caldwell Preschool Inventory

*4. The Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test

Each test was individually administered in January, 1969 (pretest) and again in May, 1969 (posttest). The Binet was administered by a black psychologist (Ph. D.) from the Institute faculty. The others were handled by two of his masters level students under his and the Principal Investigator's direction. Each tester was responsible for the same tests during the pretest and posttest administrations. All testing was preceded by classroom visitations to acclimate the Ss to the examiners.

TABLE 1. SELECTED SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

	GROUP					
	E l-c	E m-c	Cl	C2	Total l-c	Total m-c
No. males	3	5	8	6	9	13
No. females	2	5	7	9	11	12
Mean age (mos. at 1, 1969)	55	50	54	56	56	53
Mean family income	$3, 300	$9, 800	$9, 350	$2, 073	$2, 327	$9, 530
Mean family size	7.45	4.78	4.50	6.67	6.87	4.61
No. of families with parent absent	2	0	1	9	11	1

*In order to conform to our time schedule Part II was administered after a one-week interval rather than the three-week interval suggested by Brown. We also modified the original precedure by employing color film.

RESULTS

The mean and standard deviations for our measures and their subscales are presented in Table 2.

Scores on the Stanford-Binet are somewhat higher than anticipated, particularly for our lower class Ss. Considering their degree of deprivation we would not have expected them to fall as close to the national mean (100) as shown. Middle class scores were approximately one standard deviation above scores of our lower class sample.

No significant main or interaction effects were found for the Stanford-Binet or for the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (See Table 3).

Significant interaction effects were noted for the Self-Referent and Mother-Referent subscales of the Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test. (For the total score $P < .052$). The tendency for all Ss except the middle class Es was to decline on the posttest. Analysis of individual scores revealed that the lowest scorers among the middle class Es tended to improve on the posttest accounting for the overall gain. Although this might be explained in terms of regression towards the mean, we suggest that the influencing factor was the formulation of a new frame-of-reference for self-comparison induced by the introduction of our disadvantaged Ss.

The Caldwell Preschool Inventory is described as "a measure of achievement in areas regarded as necessary for success in school .....(and as being) by no means culture free." Differences may therefore be regarded as reflecting the degree of disadvantage, or advantage, upon entering the scholastic stepladder. Once again, we find that our lower class sample scores higher than the literature would predict. For Caldwell's lower class standardization sample, median Total Scores were 43 for ages 49-54 months and 46 for ages 55-60 months. A score of 59 was at the 85th percentile for the 55-60 months group; a score of 55 was at the 70th percentile of that age group. Our middle class sample was more in line with standardization predictions. The median Total Score for Caldwell's sample at ages 49-54 months was 57; for ages 55-60 months the median was 66. The measure is apparently quite sensitive to changes within this the fourth year; a score of 65 is at the 80th percentile for the 49-54 months group and at the 45th percentile for the 55-60 months group.

Significant interaction effects were noted for the Caldwell subscales Personal-Social Responsiveness and Associative Vocabulary. The former relates to practical abilities concerning self-knowledge (e.g. names, address, friends) and communications with others. The latter relates to awareness of verbal and para-verbal connotations. The interaction effect for the Caldwell Total Score was significant at .001.

TABLE 2. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR MEASURES AND SUBSCALES
(N Varies with Condition, 5⟶15)

	CONDITION							
	LO-CL				MID-CL			
	EXP		CON		EXP		CON	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Stanford-Binet	98.800 8.167	100.200 9.834	94.692 12.645	97.231 13.242	111.800 10.152	116.300 9.464	111.800 10.805	112.667 12.069
I T P A	63.000 5.292	69.600 5.177	58.083 6.007	60.667 6.867	63.286 9.393	66.714 8.807	68.667 7.499	74.000 7.943
Brown: Self-Ref.	13.400 0.894	13.000 1.000	11.917 1.084	11.917 1.929	12.429 0.976	12.429 2.149	12.700 1.059	13.100 1.370
Brown· Mother-Ref.	13.000 1.225	12.800 1.304	11.500 1.883	11.417 2.314	12.429 0.976	13.286 1.113	13.000 1.054	12.00 2.404
Brown· Total I	51.600 1.140	50.200 6.261	46.833 5.340	45.000 9.352	49.857 3.024	51.286 6.291	51.600 3.373	50.600 5.168
Caldwell· Personal-Social Responsiveness	19.600 2.881	20.600 0.894	21.545 3.078	18.727 2.867	22.571 2.149	22.429 1.902	21.538 1.761	23.231 2.048
Caldwell· Associative Vocab.	12.000 2.345	12.600 3.209	12.545 1.572	8.455 2.505	15.571 1.902	13.571 1.902	15.154 2.340	17.692 3.521
Caldwell: Concept Activation-Numerical	10.400 1.517	10.600 2.408	11.727 2.611	9.364 3.233	11.714 2.059	10.714 3.094	12.385 2.022	12.846 2.968
Caldwell: Concept Activation-Sensory	13.600 2.966	14.200 4.658	14.000 3.000	14.000 2.569	15.851 3.716	16.571 2.225	15.615 3.948	16.923 3.499
Caldwell: Total	55.600 7.603	58.600 8.062	59.818 8.436	50.545 7.866	65.857 6.986	63.286 7.931	64.692 6.909	70.692 8.769

TABLE 3. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (2X2) FOR MEASURES AND SUBSCALES

	SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P less than
Stanford-Binet	Within Cells	988.756	38	26.020		
	Regression	3758.811	1	3758.811	144.459	0.001
	Social-Class (A)	42.885	1	42.885	1.648	0.207
	Treatment (B)	15.828	1	15.828	0.608	0.440
	AB	49.049	1	49.049	1.885	0.178
I T P A	Within Cells	793.107	31	25.584		
	Regression	863.904	1	863.904	33.767	0.001
	Social-Class	16.812	1	16.812	0.657	0.424
	Treatment	4.471	1	4.471	0.175	0.679
	AB	1.476	1	1.476	0.058	0.812
Brown: Self-Ref.	Within Cells	31.659	29	1.092		
	Regression	0.272	1	0.272	0.249	0.622
	Social-Class	0.339	1	0.339	0.310	0.582
	Treatment	2.151	1	2.151	1.970	0.171
	AB	4.904	1	4.904	4.492	0.043 *
Brown: Mother-Ref.	Within Cells	51.670	29	1.782		
	Regression	9.044	1	9.044	5.076	0.032
	Social-Class	3.302	1	3.302	1.853	0.184
	Treatment	0.005	1	0.005	0.003	0.958
	AB	7.948	1	7.948	4.461	0.043 *
Brown: Total I	Within Cells	426.287	29	14.700		
	Regression	49.839	1	49.839	3.390	0.076
	Social-Class	27.231	1	27.231	1.853	0.184
	Treatment	4.399	1	4.399	0.299	0.589
	AB	60.537	1	60.537	4.118	0.052
Caldwell: Pers.-Soc. Responsiveness	Within Cells	154.708	31	4.991		
	Regression	38.165	1	38.165	7.647	0.009
	Social-Class	3.493	1	3.493	0.700	0.409
	Treatment	1.405	1	1.405	0.282	0.600
	AB	33.178	1	33.178	6.643	0.015 *
Caldwell: Assoc. Vocab.	Within Cells	108.663	31	3.505		
	Regression	25.470	1	25.470	7.266	0.011
	Social-Class	3.349	1	3.349	0.955	0.336
	Treatment	0.242	1	0.242	0.069	0.795
	AB	15.955	1	15.955	4.552	0.041 *
Caldwell: Concept Activation-Num.	Within Cells	116.754	31	3.766		
	Regression	35.133	1	35.133	9.328	0.005
	Social-Class	0.003	1	0.003	0.001	0.976
	Treatment	4.042	1	4.042	1.073	0.308
	AB	6.076	1	6.076	1.613	0.213
Caldwell: Concept Activation-Sen.	Within Cells	271.780	31	8.767		
	Regression	123.353	1	123.353	14.070	0.001
	Social-Class	0.166	1	0.166	0.019	0.892
	Treatment	0.010	1	0.010	0.001	0.974
	AB	1.875	1	1.875	0.214	0.647
Caldwell: Total	Within Cells	829.988	31	26.774		
	Regression	978.475	1	978.475	36.546	0.001
	Social-Class	59.294	1	59.294	2.215	0.147
	Treatment	1.790	1	1.790	0.067	0.798
	AB	384.562	1	384.562	14.363	0.001**

The middle class Es declined over two and one-half points while the middle class Cs gained six points. For the lower class Ss the reverse effect was noted. This finding conflicts with our hypothesis of no adverse effects upon the middle class Es. It appears that a regression effect may occur as a result of social class integration, at least on certain abilities. The sensitivity of the Caldwell Preschool Inventory to the time span encompassed by our treatment period makes it particularly salient that our middle class Es did not match the gains shown by the Cl group. This result is confounded by the four month age difference between our M-C Experimental and Control groups. If this is an extremely sensitive period for this instrument, the results may reflect an age effect rather than a treatment effect.

Table 4 offers the most direct test of our hypothesis by comparing changes in test scores for our two middle class groups independent of effects on our lower class groups. Significant treatment effects hold up for the Caldwell Associative Vocabulary subscale and for the Caldwell Total Score. Since this measure was designed to be predictive of academic success, this finding is in direct opposition to our hypothesis. However, the absence of significant effects for the Binet and the ITPA provides support for our hypothesis that intellectual abilities of middle class children are not impaired by social class integration in the classroom. The lack of a significant effect on the self-concept measure provides additional support for the hypothesis. In other words, results for three of the four measures support the hypothesis, while results for one measure do not support the hypothesis. This latter result is confounded by the age difference between the E and Cl groups.

DISCUSSION

One of the most important questions in a study of social class integration is the degree to which peer group interaction actually takes place between members of different social strata. Learning by imitation may occur in the absence of social contact but it is greatly facilitated by meaningful behavioral exchanges. Observation of our E group by the class teacher, the nursery school Director, student aides, student observers and the Principal Investigator brought agreement on the following points:

1. The lower class Ss were initially ignored by their classmates and virtually isolated during free play periods.

2. The lower class Ss initially stayed together and did not seek out other members of the class.

3. The above patterns tended to diminish over time.

TABLE 4. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR MIDDLE CLASS Ss
(E m c vs. Cl.) FOR MEASURES AND SUBSCALES

	SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P less than
Stanford-Binet	Within Cells	703.528	22	31.979		
	Regression	1858.472	1	1858.472	58.116	0.001
	Treatment	50.333	1	50.333	1.574	0.223
I T P A	Within Cells	613.116	16	38.320		
	Regression	534.977	1	534.977	13.961	0.002
	Treatment	0.686	1	0.686	0.018	0.895
Brown: Self-Ref.	Within Cells	15.251	14	1.089		
	Regression	0.564	1	0.564	0.517	0.484
	Treatment	0.152	1	0.152	0.139	0.715
Brown: Mother-Ref.	Within Cells	11.329	14	0.809		
	Regression	4.385	1	4.385	5.419	0.035
	Treatment	3.132	1	3.132	3.870	0.069
Brown: Teacher-Ref.	Within Cells	10.522	14	0.752		
	Regression	2.092	1	2.092	2.784	0.117
	Treatment	1.734	1	1.734	2.307	0.151
Brown: Peer-Ref.	Within Cells	9.848	14	0.703		
	Regression	9.866	1	9.866	14.026	0.002
	Treatment	1.077	1	1.077	1.530	0.236
Brown: Total	Within Cells	102.547	14	7.325		
	Regression	54.711	1	54.711	7.469	0.016
	Treatment	15.994	1	15.994	2.184	0.162
Caldwell: Personal-Soc. Responsiveness	Within Cells	61.957	17	3.645		
	Regression	2.988	1	2.988	0.820	0.378
	Treatment	6.258	1	6.258	1.717	0.208
Caldwell: Assoc. Vocab.	Within Cells	49.556	17	2.915		
	Regression	37.850	1	37.850	12.984	0.002
	Treatment	17.428	1	17.428	5.979	0.026*
Caldwell: Concept Activ. - Num.	Within Cells	46.823	17	2.754		
	Regression	27.682	1	27.682	10.050	0.006
	Treatment	0.175	1	0.175	0.063	0.804
Caldwell: Concept Activ. - Sen.	Within Cells	199.946	17	11.762		
	Regression	69.988	1	69.988	5.951	0.026
	Treatment	0.973	1	0.973	0.083	0.777
Caldwell: Total	Within Cells	379.461	17	22.321		
	Regression	486.166	1	486.166	21.780	0.001
	Treatment	123.756	1	123.756	5.544	0.031*

*Indicate statistically significant relationship.

4. However, even at the term's conclusion the lower class Ss were not totally accepted by their peers; some middle class Ss still continued to avoid them.

Although the parents of the lower class Es were extremely concerned about their appearance, the children were apparently perceived as being "different" by their middle class peers. The situation we observed closely parallels reports by Coleman concerning racial integration of classrooms. Our middle class Ss were keenly aware of cultural distinctions and of the higher status accompanying their own. For some, their self-concepts were apparently enhanced by the increased saliency of these distinctions created by the experimental conditions.

Yet, it would be misleading to describe their home environments as comparable to a white, middle class setting. Most of the middle class Ss were the children of junior faculty at the Institute who were often deeply concerned with black culture. Many symbols of race awareness and black pride are in evidence throughout the community, and verbal expressions, musical preferences and other components of a shared black life style were present. It, therefore, appears that middle class black children belong to a complex admixture of two separate cultures, each of which contributes to their identity and to their patterns of behavior. Although we hold that social class is the more relevant factor for the integration of educational facilities we are not suggesting that race is an unimportant consideration.

The magnitude of social class cleavage within the black community was a serendipitous finding for us. This was not only reflected in the behavior of our Ss but could be clearly noted in the reactions of the middle class parents. Their fears and concerns regarding integration strongly resembled reported attitudes in white, northern suburbs. There was not antipathy towards the disadvantaged children per se but rather a reasoned suspicion that their own children might not be placed in t' e best environment to be offered. It would appear that any large scale attempt at social class integration would have to include systematic procedures for dealing with problems of community relations.

Although the elimination of an E group at the day care center rendered our C2 group inadequate (in addition to reducing sample size which precluded probing for sex differences) we maintain that the presence of a white teacher for our C1 group did not constitute a complicating factor. Differential effects due to race of teacher would appear to be based upon children's perceptions and affective reactions to them, rather than on any inherent racial distinctions which relate to teaching skills. The Ss in C1 all had substantial contact with white adults. Most had been in an earlier nursery class with a white teacher. The faculty at the Institute was approximately 30% white and many of the children attending other classes at the nursery school were white. Moreover, the environment of the campus community tended to infuse contact between the races with a relaxed, egalitarian atmosphere.

Consequently Ss at the campus nursery school should have been aware of no unusual circumstances in the presence of a white teacher. It is possible that a lower class black group might have been severely affected by a white teacher.

Our results on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory indicate that there may in fact be some substance to the fears of middle class parents. Social class integration might lead to a leveling off of some types of performance, uplifting the disadvantaged while holding back the potential of those better prepared by background. In this instance educational policy makers would have to arrive at a value judgement as to the desirability of such a program and the extent to which it should be carried. Certainly a positive decision would be in keeping with our egalitarian principles and with our stated national goal of equal educational opportunity for all.

The results for the Binet and the ITPA are encouraging. These measures have been used more widely than the Caldwell Inventory and are more direct indicators of intellectual ability. The finding that middle class Es did not suffer impairments on these measures suggests that our hypothesis may indeed be sound.

Finally, the small size of our E and C groups and the presence of the possible confounding factor of a race of teacher difference makes it mandatory that these results be viewed as suggestive rather than as conclusive. Replication of this study with a more adequate research design must precede any attempt to generalize these results to other settings or to other samples within the same setting.

REFERENCES

Bloom, R., Whiteman, M. and Deutsch, M. Race and social class as separate factors related to social environment. American Journal of Sociology, 1965, 70 (4) pp. 471-476.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Motivational and social components in compensatory education programs: suggested principles, practices and research designs. In Grotberg, E. (Ed.), Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J., 1969.

Coleman, J. S. Equality of Educational Opportunity. U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1966.

Hess, R. D. and Shipman, V. C. Maternal influences upon early learning: the cognitive environment of urban preschool children. In Hess, R. D. and Bear, R. M. (Eds.) Early Education: Current Theory, Research and Action. Aldine Press, Chicago, 1968.

Moynihan, D. P. Moynihan believes class is the issue. Southern Education Report, 2 (9) 1967, pp. 6-10.

APPENDIX

RUSSELL NURSERY SCHOOL

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, ALABAMA

SCHEDULE

7:45 - 8:15	Arrival, Health Inspection & Independent Activity (Indoors or out)
8:15 - 8:30	All together (Purpose-Encourage Communication)
8:30 - 9:30	First Work Period (Puzzles, games, books, structured art, number concepts, illustrated stories)
9:30 - 10:00	Toilet, Wash, Snack with Story, Handwashing
10:00 - 10:40	Second Work Period (Art, Music, Dramatic play, games, free play exercises, marching)
10:40 - 10:55	Staggered twenty (20) minutes outdoor Activity All together (Purpose-Encourage Communication & Memory)
10:55 - 11:15	Toilet, wash, preparation for lunch
11:15 - 12:00	Lunch, departures for half-day without lunch
12:00	Departures for half-day with lunch
12:00 - 2:30	Toilet, wash, dress for nap, rest and nap
2:30 - 3:45	Toilet, wash, dress, mid-afternoon snack, handwashing
3:45 - 4:30	Outdoor Activity, Departures